DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 642 SO 025 106

AUTHOR	Eddy, Junius
TITLE	The Upside Down Curriculum.
INSTITUTION	Alliance for Arts Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, DC 20566.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Art Education; Core Curriculum; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Fine Arts; Interdisciplinary Approach; Program Effectiveness; *Relevance (Education)
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III

ABSTRACT

This document presents an updated version of a publication that originally appeared in print in 1970. The original document raised a number of issues and questions which, despite notable advances, are still problematic. In this revision, marginal notes up-date the original text with information concerning subsequent efforts to address raised issues such as the targeting of Federal funds and the emergence of the National Committee Arts for the Handicapped. The paper likens the status of the arts in the overarching curriculum to that of an uneasy guest in the house of education. Experiments to alleviate the situation through the British school's child-centered, open classroom approach, bring attention to the interrelatedness of arts activities and experiences. Efforts of educational research and development institutions, pilot projects, and teacher education institutions contribute to the growing concept of curriculum as an interdisciplinary experience. In addition to their fundamental value as subjects in their own right, the arts are shown to be relevant to the goals of quality education. But neither the sorts of ultimate pay-offs found in programs dealing with the arts in general education, nor the cost effectiveness of support for art education programs as exemplified in the Title I-III programs, reveal themselves to researchers, teachers, administrators or school board members in short time frames. Past attempts at art curriculum reform most often looked at programs which could fit into the existing educational stucture. But, the document suggests that the goals of art educators are in common cause agreement with the goals of humanist school reformers who seek to change the fundamental nature of the school experience itself in radical, humanizing ways. Both are involved with the social relevance of what is taught, the processes of teaching and learning whereby what is being taught is directly related to how it is being taught, and the emphasis upon affective as well as cognitive goals. Questions for the future are those of continued direction and purpose: Where to? What next? (MM)

ED 383 642

The Upsidedown Curriculum

by

Junius Eddy

Alliance for Arts Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 025 106

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Junius Eddy is a freelance consultant for education and the arts now living in Rhode Island. He was, during the late 1960s, an arts education specialist with the U.S. Office of Education. More recently, he has served as an advisor on arts education to both the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. This fall McGraw-Hill will publish his book about ways in which professional artists are working with severely handicapped children and their teachers.

© 1981

AAEAAE Alliance for Arts Education

John F. Kennedy Center
for the Performing Arts
Washington, D.C. 20566

Jack Kukuk, Director of Education
Bennett Tarleton, Director,
Alliance for Arts Education

This publication is supported by the U.S. Education Department. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that agency, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Education Department should be inferred.

Reprinted with the permission of The Ford Foundation.

Preface to the AAE Edition

I was surprised but nonetheless pleased when Jack Kukuk and Bennett Tarleton asked whether I'd be interested in having the Alliance for Arts Education re-issue "The Upsidedown Curriculum" in some kind of up-dated version. It first appeared as an article in the Summer 1970 issue of *Cultural Affairs*, a now-discontinued publication of the Associated Councils of the Arts (recently renamed the *American* Council *for* the Arts). In a somewhat expanded version, it was subsequently re-printed by the Ford Foundation which, I'm told, ultimately distributed some 20,000 copies nationwide.

So I couldn't help wondering what value such a piece could have for people reading it today, ten years later. When I first looked it over with this in mind, it seemed to me the value would be practically *nil*, chiefly because so much had happened in arts education during those ten years.

Reflecting on only a few of those developments—many of which incidently are now in jeopardy once again—one would have to note:

- the targeting of Federal funds specifically for an Arts Education (grant) Program, beginning in 1976;
- the flowering of the Arts Endowment's Artists-in-Schools Program;
- the establishment of the Alliance for Arts Education as a national coalition for advocacy and development purposes;
- the emergence of the National Committee Arts for the Handicapped;
- the appearance of the Rockefeller Panel report, *Coming to Our Senses*, in 1977, and the subsequent establishment of the Arts, Education and Americans, Inc., to continue the panel's work;
- the development of numerous "Comprehensive Plans (and Programs) for Arts Education" at state and local levels, and
- the emergence of an "arts in general education" philosophy in scores of school systems around the country, and other developments too numerous to mention.

Anyone reading "The Upsidedown Curriculum" today, however, might find some truth in the old adage that 'the more things change the more they stay the same.' Because, in many ways, despite the notable advances that have occurred, a number of issues and questions raised in its pages seem still to be with us. And perhaps that's an argument of sorts for re-printing it again—with some marginal notes to up-date it here and there.

On the other hand, I hope that today's readers will bear in mind the milieau out of which this little booklet emerged. Despite five years of extraordinary activity encouraged for the first time by the wide-ranging Federal programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, arts educators then were only beginning to sense the implications involved. And, for the most part, they were still talking to themselves.

If, however, you were among those concerned about education and the arts in 1970, chances are you would have been on hand in St. Louis at a major conference of the Associated Councils of the Arts (then, as now, known simply as "the ACA").

Though almost exclusively an arts-oriented body, the ACA had decided that the educational needs and functions of the arts had, by then, become crucial enough to form the entire agenda for its 1970 national conference. Moreover, it had also decided that the entire issue of *Cultural Affairs* (to be distributed at that summer conference) should be devoted to topics dealing with aspects of the arts and education.

The conference theme was "Youth, Education and the Arts," and in retrospect that particular gathering appears to have been a kind of catalyst for the further development of the arts education movement during the '70s. A whole new audience was becoming aware of this cause, for one thing—artists, arts administrators, and supporters of the arts. For another, many of the people who were already—or soon would be—engaged in significant developmental work around the country got to meet and talk with one another for the first time at that conference.

Indeed, only a few miles away, in the St. Louis suburb of University City, a notable pilot project was already underway in the schools, the first of many the JDR 3rd Fund would support during the 1970s to explore the possibility that the arts could become "a fundamental part of the education of every child at every level of an entire school system."

And, nearby as well, CEMREL (the regional educational lab) was just winding up its four-year assessment of the massive, Federally-supported Educational Theatre Project—and launching its curriculum-building work in aesthetic education.

So, when the ACA conference planners put the question solidly on the table, writ large before a gathering of that size and importance for perhaps the first time, it was something of a consciousness-raising occasion. Should the arts—it asked the assembled educators and arts practitioners—become *fundamental* to the education of every American child? It was a rhetorical question, of course, intended to start people thinking, not to obtain a majority opinion. Now, ten years later, however, it appears that most arts education advocates have made a solid assertion out of that somewhat venturesome question.

And yet, as then, the fundamental questions persist, and much still remains to be done in our attempts to turn the upsidedown curriculum right side up at long last.

I hope there is still some ammunition in these pages to help in that effort. There's very little in it that could be termed original thinking. As the subtitle says, it consists mainly of "some notes, queries and reflections" on the arts education scene at that time. Still, it seems to have struck a responsive chord among people who've read it; at least some of them have told me, over the years, that it seemed to put into words many of the things they themselves had been thinking about and trying to express.

I'll be grateful if it simply does that again, for a new audience.

Junius Eddy
Little Compton, RI

April, 1981

THE UPSIDEDOWN CURRICULUM

Some notes, queries, and reflections on the arts in general education.

Junius Eddy

Since the time available for non-remunerative pursuits is likely to increase, it is necessary that we examine immediately the imbalances in the curriculum. In spite of an assumed 'culture explosion,' we continue in the schools to neglect art, music, drama, dance, sculpture, and, in fact, almost everything that smacks of being non-utilitarian. Ironically, we may discover not long after 1980 that, in the 1960's and 1970's we had an upsidedown curriculum, with what was considered then to be of most worth proving to be of little value to masses of the people. Let us at least hedge our bets by assuring a reasonable balance among the several realms of human inquiry.

JOHN I. GOODLAD
The Educational Program to 1980 and Beyond

The fine arts coordinator in a state education department said not long ago that, for schools throughout his state, his goal was to achieve something like 12 per cent of the weekly classroom time for instruction in Art and Music. This works out roughly to 80 to 100 minutes a week, two 40-minute periods. Is this what we're willing to settle for, even assuming that the instruction is the very best?

The peripheral role of the arts in the general education of children in the nation's elementary and

secondary schools has been widely and endlessly documented. So let me dispense with apologies, exceptions, and qualifications right here at the outset. Certainly, there are noteworthy exceptions scattered across the land: in a handful of school systems—and in some sub-systems of the larger metropolitan systems—interesting, sometimes exciting, and often valuable things are going on, no question about it. But in relation to the nation's 20,000-odd school systems, and to the 51 million children in those systems, the generalization holds up. The arts, even "Art" and "Music," are uneasy guests in the house of education, no matter how many field trips the fourth grade takes to nearby museums.

Taking American education as a whole (that is today's 15,600 school districts and the 41½ million students they serve) this broad generalization still holds up, it seems to me, a decade later—a decade that's seen significant advances, at that! (See preface for a brief list.) Realistically, however, we still find that the arts are "uneasy guests in the house of education," taking it all in all.

We need not prolong the discussion further; the documentation exists in abundance; anyone who has bothered to examine the educational process from this point of view comes up with the same answers. The questions that now need to be addressed are of a different order. They take us in a score of different directions, toward many different levels of endeavor: and *some* of these questions—if we pursue them to their logical conclusions—lead us into the vicinity if not directly into the camp of the radical school reformers. The answers don't come easily—but the questions persist.

Elliot Eisner has tried—in a chapter of a book he edited in 1975 called "The Arts, Human Development, and Education" (published by McCutchan).

Do we really know what we want the arts to *do* and *be* in the schools? Can anyone among us articulate clearly what a school would be like if the arts were implanted as central elements in the learning experiences of each child as he moves from kindergarten (or pre-school) to graduation from high school? (It hardly matters, if such a school could be described, that it might not be an acceptable model for everyone; the point is that all too few have really tried to think out a model and place it in plain sight for others to look at.)

Or, if implanting the arts as the "central core of learning" is too unrealistic or impractical in terms of the foreseeable future, perhaps we should modify our goals somewhat. If so, how much less will we settle for? Will we accept an educational program that gives aesthetic education parity with the standard subject matter, the so-called "bread-and-butter" courses? If that were a more realistic goal, what would we teach and how would we teach it? Or per-

haps more to the point, what would the kids be learning and how would they be learning it? From direct involvement in the processes of the creative and performing arts? From frequent immersion in museums, galleries and exhibit experiences? From regular encounters, as audiences, with top-notch productions and performances? From direct interaction with professional artists in the classroom, in studio workshops, in seminars? How much of all this should happen when? At what educational level and in what sequence—if any? How do we prepare or re-train teachers? How does all of this dove-tail with other aspects of humanities education? Can we, after all, really afford it?

These are still among the fundamental questions, seems to me . . .

I would hazard a guess that in only a few places in this country are people really addressing themselves to fundamental questions of this sort. Most of us, I think, if asked to stand up at a school board meeting and speak about the role of the arts in the general education of our own children would be hard put to explain clearly what it is we're after, or why it's worth the effort in the first place. In the face of strong arguments stressing practicalities—cost-per-student, scheduling problems, staffing difficulties, lack of facilities—I suspect most of us would fall back quickly and re-group on still safer ground. This ground usually nourishes suggestions that the school merely work away steadily to get more "art" and more "music" in the curriculum. (By *more*, incidentally, do we imply a greater variety of experiences for the same number of kids, or merely additional courses or time slots devoted to what we already have, so that more children can be reached?)

The "practicalities" have, of course, taken center stage as we move further into the 1980s, with budget-cutting the order of the day. Not, it would appear, the most auspicious climate for school improvements of any kind, let alone those based in the arts. And yet, heartenningly, the advocacy efforts continue, on many different fronts. But we must, I think, make our case on ever-more reasoned and explicit grounds if we are to keep moving ahead.

Or—considering ourselves true crusaders—do we press concertedly for the step-by-step inclusion of those art forms the schools truly neglect: dance, film, and the theater arts? Would it be enough if we could ever convince the school to hire creative dramatics specialists or dance teachers in numbers equal to those art and music teachers now serving in the elementary grades? Would we consider it a major victory if, by some fluke, the school board voted to do just that? I think we would—on the theory that every little victory helps—and I think we'd have won a battle, perhaps, but lost the war!

I wonder if the tendency to think in terms of subject matter about the *rest* of the curriculum hasn't

placed us in an untenable position when it comes to a consideration of curriculum reform in the arts. It seems to have forced us, perhaps without our knowing it, to deal with the arts as separate, compartmentalized boxes of subject matter—so that we wind up being grateful if we get more time for art or music at the junior high level, and simply dazzled if we get a chance to introduce creative dramatics or dance in the primary school. I have a feeling that piece-meal changes of this kind, achieved here and there, now and then, may simply divert us from the real issues. If we continue, we may end up having cheerfully hung ourselves separately, art form by art form.

(The British Experience)

The British schools offer some interesting insights into different ways of thinking about education and the arts. Not long ago, I attended a meeting of independent school parents in Connecticut where Miss Rosemary Williams, the former head-mistress of an English primary school, talked about an educational approach called "the integrated day." This is one of a number of phrases (others are "informal education," "open classroom") used to describe a way of working with children that has sprung up recently in many primary and upper elementary schools in that country.

Due chiefly to a series of articles by Joseph Featherstone in *The New Republic*, and to other more recent reports by visitors to the British schools, this approach has aroused the interest of more and more American educators as well. Currently, variations on the model are being experimented with in a number of schools in this country. This general approach to education has been summarized as follows in a recent article in *The Center Forum*:

> It is characterized by openness and trust, and by a spatial openness of schools; doors are ajar and children are free to come and go, bringing objects of interest in and taking objects of interest out. The organization of each room is open, subject to change with changing needs. Children move comfortably in this openness from place to place and from activity to activity.
>
> Time is open . . . open to permit and release and serve children rather than to constrain and prescribe and master. The curriculum is open to

For a time, in the early 70s, it appeared that the "open education" concept might indeed be *substantially* transplanted to this country. A number of initiatives were undertaken around the nation—many with Ford Foundation support—aimed chiefly at establishing teacher centers where Open Education practitioners could be trained. (Two of these are still operating, I'm told—Lillian Weber's Workshop Center for Open Education at City College (NYC), and the Teacher Centers Exchange at The Far West Lab in San Francisco.) And, although a wholesale transplant never really flowered here in the U.S., the principles embodied in the idea have appeared in various ways in schools all across the nation—both in classroom management practice and in instructional approaches such as manipulative materials in math, the "language experience" approaches to reading, and in the humanizing qualities of the arts. A subtle influence, all in all, but a profound one.

> significant choice by adults and by children . . . Perhaps most fundamental, open education is characterized by an openness of self. . . . Administrators are open to initiatives on the part of teachers; teachers are open to the possibilities inherent in children; children are open to the possibilities in other children, in materials, in themselves.

As I listened to Miss Williams it seemed to me that the arts were everywhere in that school. The children (aged 5–7) seemed to be immersed in arts activities and experiences—painting, dramatics, sculpture, drawing, decorating, woodcraft, creative writing, dance, or games involving some or all of these elements. With slides Miss Williams emphasized that the so-called basic skills were never neglected; in fact, one saw a good deal of work going on in reading, vocabulary development, and number skills. She went on to point out, however, that the teachers had found that in countless ways experiences of an expressive or creative nature initiated or reinforced the development of cognitive skills—and vice versa. We've heard this before, of course, but it seemed actually to be happening—informally and with a kind of harmonious balance—in this school.

Furthermore, nobody seemed bent on "curriculumizing" the arts. They were available as a natural part of the child's *daily* learning experience, and he discovered and enjoyed and explored them in his own ways and in his own time, not during the 40 minutes a week somebody came in to teach him Art and Music. No one seemed to have put together An Arts Curriculum for this school, with a unit of this or a unit of that (complete with suggested materials and a teacher's guide) which the child should master in a given period of time before he could proceed to the *next* unit.

I'm not sure we're ready yet for this spontaneous an approach to the arts in many schools in the United States. Our problems are too vast. Our classroom teachers are too poorly prepared with respect to the arts and therefore too dependent on somebody's packaged curriculum unit. And our parents too generally are distressed when informality and enjoyment take place in our schools. Furthermore—particularly in federally funded projects—we tend too often to foster the haphazard imposition of one particular kind of arts experience at one education level. We

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

plump the high school kid (usually the poor, nonwhite child) down in front of Shakespeare or Brahms or the Regional Ballet without caring much who he is or what has happened to him up to that moment (or what may happen to him in the future) . . . and we wonder why he seems unresponsive. When we can't see any cognitive progress after a year of two concerts, three plays and a ballet, we decide that we've tried the arts and obviously they don't help the child much. So we get back to the real fundamentals of education such as passing the SATs. Clearly then we need to give *some* attention to the problem of sequence and continuity in the development of programs in the arts; I wish we could find a way to do it, however, without "curriculumizing" it to death, particularly in the elementary school, when the experiences of learning can indeed be discovered and explored by the child in a more personal fashion.

What came through loud and clear from Miss Williams' illustrated talk was the *interrelatedness* of arts activities and experiences. All of the arts were there, all contributing naturally to the child's learning environment and available for him to explore *every day*. And the teachers for the most part seemed to be secure enough to get out of the way (unless called upon) and let it happen. In very few of the slides Miss Williams put on the screen was the teacher prominently displayed; when you saw a teacher she was usually working unobtrusively with a single child or a small group of children . . . helping, suggesting, guiding, implementing, facilitating . . . or otherwise serving as a partner in the process of discovery—rather than TEACHING.

Nothing new in these concepts. We've heard about them for years. And in a few schools people here have been trying them out. But for me it was almost like discovering all over again what "learning is all about" to listen to this wise, witty and articulate woman from England tell about the way it happened in her school. (She said, incidentally, that she arrived there as head-mistress planning to lead the staff systematically away from all this "integrated day" romanticism and, by mid-year, had been converted. Now—fortunately for us—she is in this country for a year or two helping some of our teachers and administrators learn how they might make it happen here.)

She stayed longer than a year or two, incidentally; she married and is still here, teaching somewhere in New England, I'm told.

(Common Cause)

Is it too much to expect the arts—and their school-based practitioners, the arts educators—to come out of isolation and make common cause of this whole gallant endeavor? Or are they, in a phrase T. E. Lawrence once used to describe his friends the Arabs, "a tissue of small jealous principalities incapable of cohesion"? Is it possible—and not only when the Spring Music and Art Festival makes them uneasy once-a-year partners in the high school's cultural life—that the Art Teacher and the Music Teacher will one day come out of their offices (at opposite ends of the building), look uncritically at one another and agree that the mission is bigger than both of them?

Fortunately, there are already some encouraging ecumenical signs: here and there, it appears that the traditional barriers are breaking down—and that a kind of regenerative cross-fertilization is taking place. Which is to say that *some* of the people concerned with developments in this field are beginning to break out of their compartments in the established arts disciplines and move toward some "meaningful relationships" with one another. This is happening not only among the various art forms that make up the creative and performing arts, as educational experiences, but also between the arts collectively and other subject disciplines in the school curriculum. Whether these interdisciplinary concerns are approached under the heading of "Aesthetic Education," or referred to as "A Related Arts Program," or as "The Combined Arts Approach," or are even included under the broader rubric of "Humanities Education," the feeling seems to be abroad that—in the context of education, at least—the arts have much to gain by talking and working together.

"Common cause" has, in a way, been the watchword of the past decade. All kinds of walls have been broken down, and a host of joint efforts have come to pass—so that today, at least, we hear people referring increasingly to "arts programs," not only to "art" or to "music."

A few educational research and development institutions are now engaged in interdisciplinary curriculum building in the arts, notably CEMREL, the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, which is in the third year of what is referred to as The Aesthetic Education Program. The several associations of arts educators are making statements at their conventions and publishing pieces in their journals that suggest the old isolationism may be dying. Pilot projects concerned with "all of the arts for all of the children" are being designed and im-

CEMREL has now completed its K-6 Aesthetic Education Program, developing, field-testing, and producing a score or more instructional units to be used in elementary schools.

In Washington, the four major professional associations of arts education—NDA (dance), NAEA (art), MENC (music), and ATA (theatre)—have established an informal organization for common efforts, called the DAMT (sounds like "planet") Group.

The JDR 3rd Fund's Arts in Education Program has terminated its activities, but its 12-years of systematic support for school-based projects, networks of big-city schools, and a coalition of state education agencies for developmental work on the "arts in education" idea, has had an influence out of all proportion to its size.

Many stirred uneasily, to be sure, but only a very few could be said to have had their foundations shaken.

plemented in selected schools across the country under private as well as public sponsorship.

Several state education agencies—notably in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Vermont—are emphasizing multi-disciplinary approaches in their programs and training; teacher education institutions are (ever so slowly) beginning to see the aesthetic handwriting on the school-house wall, and, in isolated instances, are trying to figure out what ought to be done to prepare more *aesthetically* literate teachers for elementary classrooms; and even the specialist teacher training institutions (in music, art, theater, etc.) are beginning to stir uneasily as the ripples of this movement lap more and more insistently at the base of their ivory towers.

Obviously the tasks are many and incredibly diverse in this new attempt to turn the upsidedown curriculum right side up. There are tasks for theorists, conceptualizers, and planners; for experimenters, researchers, and field-testers; for artists who enjoy relating to young people, and for students who are ready to learn about feelings and sensibilities as well as to acquire knowledge; for curriculum developers, teacher trainers, and resource specialists; for strategists, innovators, and facilitators; and ultimately for writers, reporters, and disseminators.

What appears to me to be urgently needed now, however, are strategists. We need people who can begin to devise a series of game-plans for the arts-in-general-education movement, people who can force us to keep thinking about goals even as we keep on being pleased with ourselves for racking up those first downs. We need to find ways to help those who are pursuing separate parts of the task to find out what may be going on in the next city, or across town—and to make it possible for all of them to see their work in the broadest possible context.

Melvin Tumin, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at Princeton, is one of the most effective strategists around. Not long ago, he took a close look at the arts-in-education movement and presented it with a Strategy:

> As we consider the best possible strategies for energizing the role of art education in the schools, it is crucial to consider not what the goals of art may be, but rather what ways art can contribute to the more general goals of quality education.

If we are confident, as we should be, that the goals of art education are contained within the goals of general quality education, then we are in the very advantageous position of stressing the importance of art education as a valuable, if not indispensable, means toward the achievement of those more general goals; these are goals on which assent is easier to get than it would be with regard to the presumably more particular goals of art education as such. The steps, then, involve first the proof of the importance of the general goals of quality education and then, second, the proof of the relevance of art education as a means to those general goals.

Dr. Tumin was speaking to a group of art educators and his thesis, of course, may do violence to the views of the art-for-art's sake contingent in education. But at least he *has* a strategy.

(Resources and Instrumentalities)

During the last four or five years, federal funds have been flowing to the schools in unprecedented amounts, principally for programs and projects that qualified for support under the several titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Some of this money obviously found its way into projects and activities related directly or indirectly to the arts. On a percentage basis, the amounts spent on the arts were about what one would expect: somewhat under 10 per cent of the total funds.

In terms of actual dollars, however, never have the arts had such an educational windfall: something on the order of $80 million of Title III funds (the so-called "innovation" title of the act) supported arts or arts-related projects over ESEA's first five years —while Title I (special programs for the education of disadvantaged students) supported "instructional programs" in categories labeled Art, Music and Cultural Enrichment to the tune of about $200 million during its first *three* years. Even if half of the funds in the Cultural Enrichment category supported projects that had nothing to do with the arts per se, the amounts that did support such activities are sizeable indeed.

What has it all meant? Was it, as many people suspect, mainly an exercise that emphasized occasional "exposure" of some students to arts activities

Tumin did *indeed* have a strategy—probably the most effective one of all, as it turned out. The idea he enunciated has been the basis of a large number of state and local district planning efforts that have culminated in "comprehensive" programs concerned with learning in, through, and about the arts. In almost every instance, the goals for the arts were shown to be relevant to the "general goals of quality education," in addition to their fundamental value as subjects in their own right. It is this double- or triple-play potential which, in many ways, justifies our belief in a more central role for the arts in American schools.

and events, at a cost few if any local school systems could ever afford otherwise? Has it resulted in worthwhile curricular innovations that have been adopted by the project schools themselves? Were exemplary arts programs developed that actually have served as models for other schools, as the Title III architects hoped? Has all the money and attention and experimental time made any real difference in the ways we involve youngsters in arts experiences in the schools? Has it helped us learn how to use the artistic resources of our communities—and the recent upsurge of neighborhood arts activity from our racial and ethnic subcultures—more purposefully and effectively? In short, has it helped us clarify our ultimate objectives relative to the arts in education?

Nobody ever really *did* study this five-year development very intensively—as it concerned the arts at any rate.

Probably no one can provide reliable answers to such questions at this point in time but, beyond the relative successes and failures of specific projects, I think it likely that extremely valuable insights could be gained from studying intensively the broad national pattern of this five-year development. It represents an unprecedented expenditure of funds on an aspect of education that traditionally has been regarded as a frill by the majority of educators, school board members and parents. More importantly, however, it also represents an unprecedented collective experience on the part of teachers, artists, students and administrators that ought to be sifted through carefully before much more time passes to find out what it reveals in terms of general principles that might be applied when Next Time Comes.

And Next Time did Indeed Come—with the Arts Education Program legislation of 1975—but the "collective experience" of the early Title I - Title III days wasn't "sifted through" very widely for the general principles involved. The principles that seemed most to influence the new effort in the '70s appeared to come from outside the public sector—from privately-funded pilot projects like those of the JDR 3rd Fund, for example.

Aside from questions of substance—concerning what is being taught, when and how it is taught, and to what ultimate end—it may be instructive to look critically at other elements of this five-year experience as well, to examine some of the procedures and instrumentalities employed in the whole process, with particular reference to projects and programs that involved the arts.

For example, I suspect that many Title III projects have been badly misrepresented by a tendency on the part of federal program officers and local project staff alike to regard them as "demonstrations." Often, a project that has been labeled a demonstration project is really not "demonstrating" anything but is, rather, "experimenting" with something—and therefore

ought more aptly to be called "an experimental project" or "a pilot project."

This mis-labeling, it seems to me, puts the project which is probing tentatively in a new direction at a severe disadvantage because we ought to expect more of a demonstration project than we do of a pilot project. Whatever is being demonstrated presumably is *worth* demonstrating since it's unlikely that anyone would want to demonstrate a practice that *doesn't* work. On the other hand, an experimental or pilot project may by definition succeed *or* fail as perfectly legitimate outcomes of an experimental process.

Presumably, if a pilot project had a high degree of success it might develop logically into a follow-up activity that *would* be worth demonstrating somewhere. If the demonstration held up, the hope would be that other schools, in the same system as well as in other locations, would go and do likewise, as their own circumstances permitted. (Among the many wise things *The New Republic*'s Joseph Featherstone has written, this one sticks in my mind apropos of demonstrations: "New York City has tried out every good idea in educational history—once.")

So—with respect to many of the arts projects or programs which have received support from Title III or Title I of ESEA—we've really been dealing, more often than not, with pilot projects than we have with demonstration projects. My guess is that there are only a few programs involving new ways of teaching in the arts which can be *demonstrated* these days, but I suspect there are a host of new approaches that are worth *experimenting* with. This is precisely why Title III's Planning Projects were often as valuable as its Operational Projects—because they could establish truly experimental pilot projects instead of being pressured to demonstrate something before they were ready. And it is why many Operational Projects got in way over their heads trying to demonstrate something which ought to have been considered an experiment. We have usually expected too much from these Title III Operational Projects *too soon*. And, because they often have been unable successfully to demonstrate in one, or two, or three years that "the youngsters behave differently" due to this or that involvement in the arts, we have cut them off abruptly.

This kind of revolving-door approach to federal

grant-making may not necessarily appeal to project directors or school officials when it comes to education programs generally, but they have somehow learned to live with it. Moreover, in the regular subject matter fields, the indications of real effect on students, the evidence that something is working, often *can* be determined within a three-year span. However, this principle is not readily applied to certain pilot projects involving the arts in education. In many aspects of the arts there are as yet few reliable devices for determining whether some new approach is indeed worth all the bother and expense. Perhaps more longitudinal studies are needed in the arts—but obviously for this approach to produce worthwhile results, and for many other aesthetic outcomes which someday we may learn to identify and evaluate, longer periods of time are necessary in experimental work.

A few Federally-funded education programs *have* supported longer-term projects in recent years—the Teacher Corps, for example, is now completing a wide range of projects funded for a five-year cycle. However, only one project (out of 140 or so nationwide) is primarily concerned with the arts, that sponsored jointly by Hunter College and Community School District 4 in Manhatten, now in its third year with a program of teacher re-training and staff development in the arts and humanities.

It would be refreshing sometime to have a government program approve and support a pilot educational project in the arts for a five- or a ten-year period. It would, for once, be a recognition of the fact that the arts are different from other subject matter. Educational experiences in the arts may reveal their effects on the student way down the track, five or ten years later—in the creative way he expresses himself, the heightened ways in which he senses or perceives the world around him, in how he acts or reacts in personal relationships, how he handles himself in new situations, or makes decisions involving aesthetic values. These are really the sorts of ultimate pay-offs we ought to be looking for in programs dealing with the arts in *general* education, and they very seldom reveal themselves to researchers, teachers, or administrators—much less school board members, parents, and interested citizens—at the end of a *three*-year pilot project.

A longitudinal study/research idea that still hasn't been done, to my knowledge. Maybe someday . . .

It is distressing that money will probably have been wasted by allowing these arts projects to die off in so arbitrary a manner. It will be unlikely, now, that anything much will be disseminated about most of them because, with some noteworthy exceptions, they really had nothing to *demonstrate* yet! They were indeed still experimenting, but they were closing the gap year by year; and perhaps, by the end of another two, three or four years, it would have been possible to discover whole groups of students who really would be "behaving differently" because of their

exposure to and involvement in these arts processes. Perhaps, too, within the next several years, some of the sound educational researchers working in this field would have begun to zero in on some different kinds of devices for assessing such programs, so that the word *evaluation* would be more than a dirty word to the artists, a joke to the students, and a frustrating puzzle to the educators. Indeed, some of the people in these projects have begun to evolve evaluation instruments of their own that seem to have considerable assessment potential.

The lesson in all this, it seems to me, is that pilot projects in the arts in education (as opposed to demonstration projects) should be looked at differently from pilot projects in other educational fields, and be given greater developmental flexibility. Given time to see some things through to the end, and time to edge closer to evaluation techniques that may *mean* something, and some money to document what takes place so it can indeed be disseminated if it turns out to be really useful—only then, I think, will it make educational and economic sense to initiate arts projects of the Title III variety again.

(HUMANIZING THE SCHOOLS)

It is a little surprising to me that, somehow, long before this, the movers and shakers in the arts-in-general-education movement have not been recognized as strong potential allies by those educational reformers who are concerned with ways of "humanizing the schools"—and vice versa.

Perhaps this is another result of the tendency in the arts to focus rather narrowly on subject matter and to consider curriculum reform as "improvement" rather than major change. In a remarkably cogent and insightful piece for *Educational Leadership*, Elliot Eisner recently pointed out that "the vast majority of curriculum development projects in the sciences and mathematics have demanded no structural change on the part of the institution. These programs, like interchangeable parts, were designed to fit into the existing structure. Can humanities and arts programs succeed in such a structure or will they demand a reconceptualization of how schooling proceeds?"

I suspect our attempts at curriculum reform in the arts have been concerned more with programs that might fit into the existing educational structure than

Arts projects of this general kind *were*, of course, initiated again, though much more modestly supported, under the OE/ED Arts Education Program beginning in 1976. And although some cursory evaluation and documentation seems to have been done, very little about what works and what doesn't, the processes employed and the materials developed, has yet been *disseminated* on the 350 or so projects funded during this 1976-80 period.

We still seem to undervalue what research, assessment, and careful documentation could unearth and deliver to us. At least very little money is allocated for it.

And so, when the *Next* Next Time Comes, if it does, we may once again find ourselves starting all over again—from scratch. In this field, it seems, the past is not necessarily a great teacher. We are splendid Wheel Reinventors, though!

Somehow, the potential inherent in this seemingly advantageous alliance, for stengthening the position of the arts in our schools, has never been fully realized. Maybe the problem does indeed lie in the unrealistic perceptions both camps have of one another; maybe it's just that they've been so busy making their own cases they never looked beyond their noses.

But, whatever the reasons (and acknowledging several attempts to bridge the gap that might be described as "near misses"), this is an opportunity that only a very few—on either side—have really seized to any purposeful effect.

It surprises me, too—because the reasons for such an alliance still seem to be cogent and persuasive, whether you're speaking of "the school reform movement" in its so-called "radical" form (as I was ten years ago), or simply as fundamental educational change.

with programs that might lead to fundamental changes in the nature of the school experience itself. As a result, we have failed to sense how close we are to the concerns of those who—from a different vantage point—are seeking ways to humanize the educational process. And those who want to reform the schools in quite radical ways have failed to sense how similar their conceptions of education are to the kinds of processes and experiences which uniquely the arts can provide. The reformers see arts educators as curriculum-tinkerers in specialized fields rather than as an embodiment of precisely those humanistic values they envision at the heart of the whole educational process; arts educators regard the reformers either as wild-eyed radicals, unstructured sensitivity-training adherents, or merely as tinkerers with administrative and instructional practices rather than as genuine allies in the aesthetic education cause.

What are some of the conceptual similarities? Well, for one thing, the humanist school reformers are deeply involved with the social relevance of what is being taught. Certainly, the arts speak directly to this issue, in their concern with the value of direct experience, with the immediacy of feelings, with a spontaneous response to one's environment, and with gaining insights about the past through aesthetic experiences in the present. One of the basic tools of relevant education, it seems to me, is the development and refinement of perceptual skills and this, of course, is a matter the arts are peculiarly equipped to illuminate.

The radical school reformers are also deeply concerned about the *processes* of teaching and learning; they see educational reform increasingly in terms of the ways in which teachers are functioning—in the classroom or out of it—to develop less authoritarian and more creative relations with students. And they see the problem of relevance in *what* is being taught as having a direct relationship to *how* it is being taught.

It seems to me that here, in their distinctive approaches to the ways in which teaching generally can be carried on, the arts may ultimately make one of their most effective contributions to educational reform. The arts, as processes—as ways of working creatively with individuals and groups—need to be examined carefully for their application to teaching

situations as humanizing instrumentalities. In this concept, I am convinced, there exists the possibility of achieving something akin to genuine democracy in education.

Another major tenet of the current school reform movement is its emphasis on affective as well as cognitive goals. Mario Fantini and Gerald Weinstein recently discussed this question in the *NEA Journal* and, interestingly enough, without once referring to the role of the arts: "In the standard educational process," they wrote, several years ago, "cognitive development is equated with 'knowing about' a variety of academic subjects, rather than with an understanding of how these subjects may serve the student's needs. Too many instructional roads seem to lead to cognition as the end product. Yet it is obvious that knowing something cognitively does not always result in behavior that follows on that knowing. This is because knowledge alone cannot influence total behavior. Moreover, all kinds of knowledge are not equally influential. The missing ingredient in this equation seems to be knowledge that is related to the *affective or emotional* world of the learner" (emphasis added). When they speak of "the emotional world of the learner" and of the need for educators to link a student's feelings to what they hope to teach him, reformers like Fantini and Weinstein are touching on questions the arts should be dealing with but seldom do.

Beyond this, but growing directly out of these same concerns, is "identity"—the need young people have for discovering who they really are, their need for positive relationships with others, and for learning what they can (or cannot) do to gain some measure of control over what happens to them. These are also issues that relate directly to the search for "a more humane education," and they are obviously in the realm of feelings and emotions which are uniquely susceptible to discovery by the student through involvement with the processes and products of the creative and performing arts. This is especially true for students who come from non-white ethnic backgrounds and from poverty-stricken environments.

It is, in fact, the conspicuous failure of education to respond humanely to the social, emotional *and* educational needs of minority-group youth in urban

schools which has been chiefly responsible for infusing the movement to humanize the schools with a new sense of moral indignation, urgency, and commitment these last several years. Conversely, one of the settings outside the schools which has been able to meet and nourish these needs most effectively is the neighborhood arts center. At their best, these new community-centered programs that focus on arts experiences and activities have developed intriguing alternatives to big-city, public education—and they suggest ways of thinking about educational environments that have profound implications for the schools.

One of the most important developments of the 1965-70 period—but perhaps the least understood and taken advantage of by those in arts education generally.

In some ways, the new wave of educational reform may well present the arts-in-education movement with a unique tactical opportunity. For once, the arts—by which I mean arts educators, artists, and their community-based resources—can join in a movement with non-arts educators and find themselves in the company of sympathetic companions from many different camps, all moving in the same general direction over reasonably common ground. Toward what end? Well, that of course is the Ultimate Question. The Tumin Strategy envisions general education goals more or less commonly accepted by all those who are concerned with education of high quality—and such goals would probably include humanizing elements acceptable to arts educators and school reformers alike. Or would they? For the questions persist. *Is* it possible to define common goals? Agree on joint objectives? Create new options? Discover better alternatives? Develop unifying strategies? Settle on immediate tactics? Nice, big, global questions.

Interestingly enough, they turn out to be variants of the same question, because the concept of *change* is centrally at issue. Certainly, it's easier to think up such questions and ask them at random than it is to suggest answers. But this may be one of those times—following a period of intense and active involvement in new program development—when it's important once again for those concerned about the future of arts and humanities education in this country to try to come to grips with basic issues and principles. And therefore, I suppose, it follows that we must address ourselves to those difficult fundamental questions. As Carl Sandburg put it in *The People Yes*: Where to? What next?

And now, after a decade in which some important changes have indeed taken place in this field, I suspect we're entering yet *another* of those times when, facing even more uncertain prospects, those same fundamental questions must be addressed more purposefully than ever before.